

COURT OF JUSTICE REPORT

Alleged Conduct of Robert Bulmar

Prepared for	Review by competent investigative and judicial authorities
Declarant	Joo-yeon Kim
Subject	Robert Bulmar (also written as Robert Bulmer in the source notes)
Source record	combinedBulmar.txt; 64 asterisk-separated note units; approximately 60,000 words
Report date	June 28, 2026

Status: This is a structured presentation of the declarant's allegations and requested lines of inquiry. It is not a finding of fact, a charging instrument, or a legal opinion. Each allegation requires independent authentication and fair response from the named subject.

Executive Overview

The source record alleges that Robert Bulmar, a former co-resident of the declarant, later advanced or participated in claims that the declarant obtained ideas from a digital storage medium or from materials left in the shared residence. The declarant denies that any such storage medium existed. He states that the only object he took from a container of belongings left after Bulmar moved out was a low-value multimeter, not a computer drive, USB device, server component, or other data-storage device.

The record further alleges that Bulmar attempted, or appeared through indirect online references to attempt, to claim credit for particular concepts after the declarant had presented them. The clearest named disputes concern a digital archive narrative, a space-escalator concept, a large or 'jumbo' motorcycle concept, and possibly a spherical spacecraft concept. The last of these is repeatedly qualified by the declarant as uncertain. Other references to unspecified ideas are too general to be treated as separate, proven acts.

A central part of the declarant's account is that Bulmar allegedly made an earlier confession or otherwise abandoned the claims, after which there was a long period of silence. The declarant interprets later images, avatars, thumbnails, and 'relay' messages as a revival of the same accusations. The source does not provide a dated recording, verbatim statement, authenticated account identifier, or identified witness quotation for the alleged confession. That gap is material: the alleged confession may be highly important if corroborated, but it cannot be treated as established on the present record.

The source also attributes to Bulmar a separate act of waiting near the declarant's room to take an embarrassing photograph while the declarant was wearing dirty clothing, allegedly for public release or humiliation. This allegation is more directly worded in one source unit than the online 'relay' allegations, but the record still lacks the image, device data, publication record, or witness confirmation needed to prove it.

The requested investigation should therefore focus on attribution, chronology, authenticity, and access. It should not assume that an idea similarity proves copying, that a thumbnail was authored by Bulmar, that physical proximity proves access, or that repetition across the declarant's own notes supplies independent corroboration. Conversely, the absence of a polished contemporary record should not cause investigators to disregard retrievable metadata, witnesses, account logs, design-file histories, emails, or device evidence.

Principal Investigative Questions

- Did Bulmar ever state, directly or through an authenticated account, that the declarant obtained ideas from a drive, discarded computer, server, USB device, or other stored archive?
- What precise words, date, medium, audience, and surrounding circumstances support the alleged confession or abandonment of claims?
- Did Bulmar possess or communicate any dated, independently verifiable record of the disputed concepts before the declarant's presentations?
- Can platform records attribute the 'old server becomes a new server,' recycled-computer, bicycle, pyramid, or related thumbnails to Bulmar rather than to an unrelated recommender or third party?
- Did Bulmar photograph the declarant near the bedroom, and was any image transmitted, posted, or used to humiliate or pressure him?
- Was there any agreement between Bulmar and another person to obtain credit, money, access, or leverage through false statements, or were the perceived similarities independent and ambiguous?

Contents

1. Scope, Method, and Evidentiary Labels
2. Identity and Attribution Safeguards
3. Relationship History and Opportunity
4. Chronology of the Alleged Conduct
5. Digital Storage or Lost-Archive Allegation
6. Idea-Specific Appropriation Allegations
7. Alleged Confession, Silence, and Revival
8. Alleged Photography and Reputational Targeting

9. Declarant's Independent-Origin Account
 10. Cumulative Assessment and Competing Explanations
 11. Claimed Harm
 12. Conditional United States Legal Analysis
 13. Jurisdiction and Charging Limits
 14. Evidence Preservation and Investigation Plan
 15. Questions for the Subject and Witnesses
 16. Conclusion
- Appendices A-C

1. Scope, Method, and Evidentiary Labels

This report focuses solely on alleged conduct attributed to Robert Bulmar. The combined source includes extensive material about Steve, Elon Musk, political figures, relatives, and other persons. Those allegations are excluded except where a limited reference is necessary to explain a claimed interaction involving Bulmar, such as the allegation that Steve opposed Bulmar's digital-storage claim. No conduct of another person is imputed to Bulmar merely because the declarant grouped them together.

The source contains 64 asterisk-separated units originating from separate text files. Each unit was treated as a source article or observation block. Repeated statements were synthesized into one allegation rather than counted as multiple witnesses or events. The report does not use the volume or emotional intensity of repetition as evidence of truth.

The following evidentiary labels are used throughout:

- **Direct recollection:** the declarant describes an event he says he personally observed, such as the shared-house proposal or the multimeter taken from a discarded-items container.
- **Reported interpretation:** the declarant identifies a thumbnail, avatar, song, video, or other online item as a message about him or as originating from Bulmar, but the source does not authenticate that attribution.
- **Inference:** the declarant draws a conclusion about motive, copying, jealousy, or coordination from timing, proximity, similarity, silence, or later conduct.
- **Expressly uncertain:** the declarant uses phrases such as 'I believe,' 'may have,' 'if,' 'I cannot remember,' or 'I don't know.' Such points are investigative leads, not factual assertions.
- **Corroboration requested:** the source itself asks witnesses or authorities to recover records and verify the event.

Fairness rule: A professional assessment must test both inculpatory and exculpatory possibilities. The goal is to determine what happened, not to convert ambiguous online material into a predetermined conclusion.

2. Identity and Attribution Safeguards

The source uses the spellings 'Robert Bulmar' and 'Robert Bulmer.' It also refers to several unrelated people named Robert, including Robert Workman, Robert Kiyosaki, Robert Ettinger, a person described as Becky's husband Robert, and Robert Greene. Only references that clearly name Bulmar or are anchored to the former co-resident are included here.

The repeated appearance of a face, avatar, title, fictional character, song, recommended video, or screenshot is not by itself proof that Bulmar selected, authored, transmitted, endorsed, or controlled that content. Attribution requires account identifiers, URL and timestamp data, platform logs, message headers, device records, or a reliable witness who observed Bulmar's act.

The report also distinguishes an allegation that Bulmar claimed credit from proof that Bulmar used or commercialized an idea. The present source does not identify a Bulmar patent application, product launch, company filing, investor pitch, sale, licensing transaction, source-code repository, design file, or revenue stream tied to a disputed concept. Investigators should search for such evidence, but should not presume it exists.

3. Relationship History and Opportunity

3.1 Shared residence

The declarant places Bulmar in a Toronto shared residence with Steve and Cesar in approximately 2015 or 2016. Before moving to a lower-floor room, the declarant says he proposed placing his CNC machines and 3D printers in a shared downstairs area because of noise, odor, and ventilation limitations in his own room. He says Cesar and Steve agreed, while Robert refused. This is the clearest direct interaction between the declarant and Bulmar described in the source.

Source: 184866.txt, combined lines 18-23; jo3ij2i3ojoi32.txt, combined lines 5795-5835.

3.2 Access and proximity

The shared-house arrangement could have given Bulmar some opportunity to observe equipment, overhear conversation, or see materials located in common areas. The declarant specifically speculates that Bulmar overheard a kitchen conversation about possible investment from Adam, Zuckerberg, or Elon Musk and about the value assigned to ideas. The declarant says Bulmar's room was close enough to hear and that Bulmar moved out shortly afterward.

This is an opportunity theory, not proof of access to a particular file or concept. The source does not establish which room Bulmar occupied, the exact dates, whether doors were open, what words were spoken, whether Bulmar was present, or whether any disputed design was displayed. Those details should be reconstructed through tenancy records, witnesses, messages, and metadata.

Source: joi3j2io3ji2.txt, combined lines 6096-6126.

3.3 Departed belongings

The declarant states that after Bulmar left, Bulmar had placed or left items in a plastic container. The declarant denies finding any storage medium in the container. He says the only object he took was a multimeter with a low resale value, which he examined after Bulmar was gone. If accurate, that fact directly contradicts a narrative that the declarant discovered an archive of ideas in discarded electronics.

The source does not provide photographs of the container, an inventory, testimony from other residents, purchase records for the multimeter, or a forensic record of devices present in the home. The claim is therefore testable but not yet corroborated.

Source: jjo3joi23jo2.txt, combined lines 5661-5710.

4. Chronology of the Alleged Conduct

Period	Event asserted	Evidentiary status
Before 2015/16	Declarant develops maker, marketing, fabrication, and product interests through earlier contacts and projects.	Independent-origin background; requires records and witnesses.
Approx. 2015/16	Declarant and Bulmar reside in the same Toronto house; Bulmar allegedly refuses shared placement of CNC/3D-printing equipment.	Direct recollection; tenancy and witness confirmation needed.
House period	Bulmar allegedly could overhear investment and idea discussions; alleged photograph near declarant's room.	Partly inferential; device/image evidence absent.
Move-out period	Bulmar leaves items in a plastic container; declarant says he takes only a multimeter.	Direct recollection; inventory and witnesses needed.
Later, date unknown	Bulmar allegedly advances a digital-storage or lost-archive accusation and possibly idea-credit claims.	Mostly inferred from online imagery; no authenticated statement supplied.
Years ago, date unknown	Bulmar allegedly confesses or abandons the claims; Steve allegedly opposes the storage claim.	Material but uncorroborated; words, date, medium, and witnesses missing.

Period	Event asserted	Evidentiary status
Long silence	Declarant says the dispute appeared resolved and he resumed work.	Sequence asserted; exact duration not established.
2025-26 notes	Declarant interprets renewed thumbnails, avatars, and relays as Bulmar reviving the claims.	Reported interpretation; platform attribution required.

Chronology limitations

The source often describes relative order but not calendar dates. The alleged confession, storage accusation, motorcycle dispute, space-escalator dispute, and spherical-ship dispute must be placed on a verified timeline before motive or follow-up can be evaluated. Statements such as 'years ago,' 'after the confession,' and 'later' are insufficient for charging analysis without anchoring events.

5. Digital Storage or Lost-Archive Allegation

5.1 Alleged accusation

The most consistently repeated Bulmar-specific allegation is that Bulmar claimed, suggested, or was represented online as claiming that the declarant acquired ideas from a digital storage medium, discarded computer, old server, or similar archive. One note identifies a thumbnail associated in the declarant's mind with Bulmar's avatar and the phrase 'your old server becomes a new server,' together with an image of a computer. Another describes recycled-computer imagery. The declarant interprets these materials as a claim that he found Bulmar's stored ideas.

Source: fewq324213.txt, combined lines 241-272; garetw34123.txt, lines 563-648; hiuhiy987.txt, lines 4104-4235; jjo3joi23jo2.txt, lines 5661-5710.

5.2 Declarant's denial

The declarant gives a categorical denial: there was no digital storage device, no written cache of Bulmar's ideas, and no archive from which the declarant could have extracted the disputed concepts. He states that he would have been unable to predict or safely risk whether Bulmar held independent records elsewhere if the ideas were not his own. He relies on that perceived exposure risk as part of his innocence reasoning.

The declarant also argues that the concepts emerged over an extended period in response to changing design problems and public interactions. In his view, a pre-existing archive would be inconsistent with the visible trial-and-error sequence and with the long gaps between ideas. That reasoning can support an investigation, but it does not substitute for forensic comparison of actual files and timestamps.

5.3 Alleged contradictions

- Bulmar allegedly knew or could have known that the house and the declarant's work were being observed, making silence at the time inconsistent with later ownership claims.
- Steve allegedly opposed Bulmar's storage claim and said there was no digital device or USB drive. This is a reported witness lead, not authenticated testimony.
- Bulmar allegedly confessed after the initial accusation without reserving claims to a stored archive or particular concepts.
- The later narrative allegedly appeared only after the declarant had developed and presented the concepts, rather than as a contemporaneous, detailed claim.
- No third-party pre-dispute record is identified in the source, such as a dated email, cloud upload, patent filing, repository commit, message to a friend, or investor submission.

5.4 Evidence needed

Investigators should identify the exact statement attributed to Bulmar before evaluating falsity or intent. If the allegation rests only on recommendation-algorithm content that Bulmar did not send or control, there may be no Bulmar statement to investigate. If an authenticated account or witness establishes that Bulmar did make the claim, investigators should then compare device inventories, move-out records, cloud histories, emails, and file metadata.

6. Idea-Specific Appropriation Allegations

6.1 Space-escalator or cubic construction concept

The declarant repeatedly states that Bulmar attempted to take credit for, or challenge his credit to, a space-escalator concept involving incremental cubic structures. He recalls Steve defending him against Bulmar and his sister praising him, and he says Bulmar later confessed. The declarant's technical notes describe a progression from zero-gravity manufacturing and interlocking cubes to a revised bottom-up structure using tracks, cutting machines, and sequential placement. He offers that evolving design path as evidence of independent creation.

The account is specific about the declarant's design evolution but not about Bulmar's alleged competing work. The source says, 'I have no idea what Robert presented,' and reasons that any Bulmar version must have followed. That admission is important. Without the competing content, timestamp, and provenance, investigators cannot compare expressive or technical overlap.

Source: gwer432123.txt, lines 2683-2955; j3joi3j3.txt, lines 5428-5541.

6.2 Jumbo motorcycle or large-vehicle concept

The declarant recalls that Bulmar rode and parked a self-made tricycle at the house. He interprets later bicycle-related material as a possible attempt by Bulmar to claim the declarant's jumbo motorcycle design. The declarant distinguishes the two: his concept allegedly developed from a Men in Black monocyte, a Batman v Superman vehicle scene, high-diameter wheels, passenger placement between

wheels, rotating or multilevel compartments, folding access structures, and later flight-related variations.

A self-made tricycle may establish Bulmar's general mechanical interest, but it does not establish prior conception of the declarant's later design. Conversely, the declarant's detailed evolution does not prove Bulmar made an ownership claim. The alleged claim must first be located and attributed. If found, the comparison should focus on specific non-generic elements, dated sketches, source files, and communications rather than the broad category of bicycles or large wheels.

Source: gre34231323.txt, lines 1336-1385; he5341234.txt, lines 4014-4050; yvguioh7980.txt, lines 7878-7980; yvguioh7980.txt, lines 8070-8095.

6.3 Spherical spacecraft concept

The source contains a possible allegation that Bulmar tried to claim the spherical spacecraft concept. The declarant describes rotating spheres around a hollow rod to simulate gravity and connect transport spaces. However, his attribution to Bulmar is expressly uncertain. He writes that Bulmar 'may have tried' to take it, that Steve may have defended him, and elsewhere states that he cannot remember whether Bulmar tried.

This point should remain an investigative lead only. It should not be stated as an established Bulmar act unless a contemporaneous statement, witness, message, or design record is recovered. The uncertainty is not a minor drafting detail; it changes the evidentiary weight of the allegation.

Source: gwert3424.txt, lines 3063-3075; hoii98089.txt, lines 4887-4897.

6.4 Other unspecified ideas

Several notes accuse 'Robert and Steve' of trying to steal 'this idea' or ideas generally. Because the referenced concept is not always identifiable from the immediate text and because another person is grouped with Bulmar, those statements cannot responsibly be expanded into separate Bulmar allegations. They show the declarant's continuing concern, but they do not identify the actus reus, date, communication, or property at issue.

Source: ugfuu67786.txt, lines 7552-7588; additional generalized references throughout combinedBulmar.txt.

7. Alleged Confession, Silence, and Revival

7.1 What the declarant alleges

The declarant states repeatedly that Bulmar confessed 'years ago,' that the confession concerned the dispute as a whole, and that the matter then became silent or resolved. He reasons that if Bulmar had genuinely retained claims to particular ideas or a storage archive, those reservations would have been made at the time. He further alleges that later claims are adaptations designed to exploit faded memory, missing records, changed audiences, or ambiguity.

Source: garetw34123.txt, lines 563-648; gre324333.txt, lines 1089-1103; hiuhi98789.txt, lines 4052-4102; j3oij32oj3i.txt, lines 5544-5625; joi3j2io3ji2.txt, lines 6125-6126.

7.2 Evidentiary importance and present deficiency

A genuine admission against interest, retraction, apology, or express abandonment could be important evidence. The current record, however, does not state the exact words, identify the medium, fix the date, name the audience with precision, or attach a recording or message. It also does not distinguish among a confession to false accusation, a concession about one idea, an apology for conduct, a joke, or the declarant's interpretation of indirect online content.

Investigators should not infer the scope of the confession from later silence alone. Silence may be consistent with abandonment, but it may also reflect disengagement, lack of awareness, platform absence, or a decision not to respond. The correct course is to recover the original communication and interview witnesses separately.

7.3 Alleged revival

The declarant says Bulmar later 'revived' himself through repeated online references after a long quiet period. He interprets this as persistence, retaliation, or an effort to reverse the earlier resolution. Yet the source largely identifies the revival through visual or thematic content rather than direct messages from a verified Bulmar account. Attribution is therefore the first factual issue, before motive or legal significance.

8. Alleged Photography and Reputational Targeting

8.1 Photograph near the declarant's room

One source unit states that Bulmar waited in front of the declarant's room to photograph him in dirty pants and that the purpose was to retain the image for public display. An earlier nearby note describes a person sitting at a kitchen table for hours to obtain an embarrassing photograph, though the pronoun use there is less clear. Read together, the notes appear to attribute a humiliating-photograph incident to Bulmar.

The alleged photograph is not attached. There is no EXIF data, device identification, upload record, recipient, platform post, or witness statement. Investigators should ask whether the image exists, who possessed it, whether it was transmitted, and whether the declarant contemporaneously objected or discussed the incident. If no image or transmission is found, the allegation should remain uncorroborated.

Source: hiuhi98789.txt, lines 4052-4060; jjo3joi23jo2.txt, lines 5680-5688.

8.2 Broader framing or defamation concern

The declarant describes Bulmar's alleged conduct as 'framing,' by which he appears to mean the deliberate creation of a false narrative that he stole ideas. The source does not identify a specific recipient who heard a false Bulmar statement, a publication with words attributable to Bulmar, or a measurable lost transaction caused by it. Those details are essential to distinguish private disagreement, mistaken inference, reputational tort, fraud, harassment, and protected expression.

9. Declarant's Independent-Origin Account

9.1 Pre-residence interests

The declarant relies heavily on a history that predates the shared house. He describes online marketing and direct-response study from his early adulthood; maker and fabrication interests following contact with Bryan Bishop around 2009; time in Vanuatu from approximately 2010 to 2013; discussions with Suhail in Waterloo around 2013 or 2014; film-equipment concepts discussed with Eugene; homesteading, CALA-loan, tiny-house, and prototyping interests; and purchases of CNC and 3D-printing equipment before closer interaction with the house residents.

These facts, if corroborated, would establish a background of independent interest. They would not automatically prove priority for every later concept, but they could rebut a broad claim that Bulmar introduced the declarant to fabrication, product development, or maker activity. Relevant corroboration includes emails, purchase histories, domain-registration records, school communications, travel records, archived websites, and witness statements from Bryan Bishop, Suhail, Eugene, Cesar, and others with first-hand knowledge.

Source: 184866.txt, lines 4-23; jo3ij2i3ojoi32.txt, lines 5775-5847.

9.2 Process evidence

The declarant says many concepts were created visibly through iterative trial and error. He points to changing sketches, failed configurations, design revisions, cross-application of shapes, and responses to perceived feedback. For the motorcycle, he describes multiple seating, wheel, access, and flight configurations. For the space-escalator concept, he describes a change from a top-down or orbital-mass approach to a bottom-up track-and-cube construction method.

Version history can be powerful evidence if it is authentic and time-stamped. Investigators should recover original native files, not only screenshots or exported PDFs. File-system timestamps alone may be altered; stronger evidence includes cloud revision history, email attachments, platform uploads, repository commits, backup snapshots, and third-party receipt dates.

9.3 The foresight-versus-follow-up argument

The declarant's recurring argument is that a true originator would have expressed detailed 'foresight' before or during the declarant's development, while Bulmar allegedly appeared only afterward with generic similarities. This is a useful chronology hypothesis, but not an absolute rule. People may fail to document ideas, may not see a presentation, may remain silent for non-culpable reasons, or may independently reach similar solutions. The argument gains weight only when paired with authenticated dates, access evidence, substantial specific similarity, false statements, or an admission.

10. Cumulative Assessment and Competing Explanations

10.1 Factors that could support further inquiry

- A shared-residence relationship created at least some opportunity for observation or overhearing.
- The declarant provides a specific alternative explanation for the object taken from Bulmar's discarded-items container: a multimeter, not a storage device.
- The declarant consistently identifies the digital-storage narrative as the core Bulmar claim across multiple source units.
- The alleged earlier confession, opposition from Steve, and long silence could materially undermine later claims if independently verified.
- The declarant identifies potential witnesses, emails, eBay records, design files, and platform records that could confirm or disprove parts of the account.
- The motorcycle and space-escalator notes contain concrete descriptions of development sequences that can be compared against dated files.

10.2 Factors that presently limit an adverse conclusion

- No authenticated direct Bulmar communication is included in the source record.
- The alleged confession lacks exact words, date, medium, and identified testimony.
- Many claimed messages are inferred from thumbnails, avatars, songs, fictional scenes, recommendation feeds, or thematic 'relays.'
- Several idea-specific accusations are conditional or expressly uncertain, especially the spherical spacecraft claim.
- No Bulmar commercial use, patent filing, investor pitch, copied file, revenue, or product is identified.
- Broad concepts such as cubes, bicycles, digital storage, servers, or spherical vehicles are not by themselves distinctive proof of copying.
- The declarant's repeated notes are one person's repeated account, not independent corroboration.
- The source sometimes groups Bulmar with others, creating a risk that another person's alleged conduct could be misattributed to him.

10.3 Plausible competing explanations to test

- Bulmar made the alleged statements and knowingly advanced a false ownership narrative for advantage or retaliation.
- Bulmar made a narrower or different statement that the declarant reasonably or unreasonably interpreted as a broad theft accusation.

- An unrelated third party or platform recommendation produced the content; Bulmar did not author or select it.
- Bulmar independently conceived a similar general idea without access to the declarant's protected material.
- The parties discussed generic maker concepts in the house and later remembered the exchange differently.
- The alleged confession concerned only one incident, not all idea claims.
- A digital object existed but contained no disputed ideas, or the multimeter was mistaken for another object by a witness.

Assessment: The present record supports preservation requests and targeted interviews. Standing alone, it does not establish beyond a reasonable doubt, or even by a reliable civil evidentiary record, that Bulmar stole, used, threatened, defamed, or fraudulently claimed the declarant's ideas.

11. Claimed Harm

The declarant attributes substantial emotional distress, fear, anger, lost time, inability to focus, reputational concern, uncertainty about ownership, and perceived danger to the repeated dispute. He describes having to defend the same issues over years and feeling unable to work freely while claims could be revived. These harms are sincerely described in the source, but causation must be tied to proven acts by Bulmar rather than to unrelated persons, algorithmic content, or the declarant's own interpretation.

Investigators should document concrete consequences where possible: lost contracts, rejected investment, takedown notices, account restrictions, messages from recipients, medical or counseling records offered voluntarily, contemporaneous complaints, relocation costs, or time-stamped interruptions to work. General distress alone does not identify the responsible actor or legal offense.

12. Conditional United States Legal Analysis

The following provisions are screening frameworks only. Their inclusion does not assert that the elements are met. Most alleged events occurred in Canada, the subject's citizenship and location are not established, and the source does not identify a federal investigation, U.S. victim location, U.S. account, or act committed in the United States. Prosecutors and qualified counsel must determine applicable law and venue after facts are authenticated.

12.1 Copyright: expression, not ideas

Under 17 U.S.C. 102(a), copyright may protect original authorship fixed in a tangible medium, including drawings and text. Section 102(b), however, excludes ideas, procedures, processes, systems, methods, concepts, principles, and discoveries from copyright protection. Therefore, a claim that someone copied the general idea of a sphere, cube, motorcycle, server, or construction method is not enough.

Investigators would need to identify copied protectable expression, such as particular drawings, text, or original visual arrangement, and address ownership, registration, access, and substantial similarity.

[Official U.S. Code: 17 U.S.C. 102](#)

12.2 Trade-secret theft and civil misappropriation

18 U.S.C. 1832 can apply when a person knowingly steals, copies, receives, or conspires to obtain a trade secret, intending economic benefit for someone other than the owner and intending or knowing the owner will be injured. Under 18 U.S.C. 1839, protected information may include designs, prototypes, methods, and engineering information, but the owner must have taken reasonable secrecy measures and the information must derive economic value from not being generally known or readily ascertainable.

The declarant's public presentations and described on-screen development may weaken trade-secret status for disclosed material. Undisclosed native files, private technical details, or confidential presentations could still require separate analysis. The source presently does not prove unauthorized acquisition, actual use, secrecy measures, or a qualifying interstate or foreign-commerce nexus. The Defend Trade Secrets Act, 18 U.S.C. 1836(b), creates a private civil action when a qualifying trade secret related to interstate or foreign commerce is misappropriated.

[Official U.S. Code: 18 U.S.C. 1832](#)

[Official U.S. Code: 18 U.S.C. 1836](#)

[Official U.S. Code: 18 U.S.C. 1839](#)

12.3 Wire fraud and attempt or conspiracy

18 U.S.C. 1343 requires a scheme to defraud or to obtain money or property through materially false pretenses and a qualifying interstate or foreign wire transmission used to execute the scheme. A false boast, mistaken authorship claim, or private ownership dispute is not automatically wire fraud. The evidence would need to identify the property objective, material misrepresentation, intent, victim, transmission, and causal role of the wire. 18 U.S.C. 1349 covers attempt or conspiracy to commit a Chapter 63 offense, but an agreement and criminal objective must be proved; parallel conduct or shared themes are insufficient.

[Official U.S. Code: 18 U.S.C. 1343](#)

[Official U.S. Code: 18 U.S.C. 1349](#)

12.4 Interstate cyberstalking

18 U.S.C. 2261A(2) addresses an intentional course of conduct using qualifying interstate or foreign communication facilities, undertaken with the statutorily required intent and causing, attempting to cause, or reasonably expected to cause the specified fear or substantial emotional distress. The source describes distress and repeated perceived online references, but it does not yet authenticate Bulmar as the sender, establish a course of conduct by him, or prove the required intent and jurisdictional nexus. Ambiguous recommendation-feed content should not be treated as cyberstalking without attribution.

[Official U.S. Code: 18 U.S.C. 2261A](#)

12.5 Interstate threats

18 U.S.C. 875(c) concerns a communication in interstate or foreign commerce containing a threat to kidnap or injure another person. The present source does not identify a direct threat communicated by Bulmar. It therefore does not presently support a Bulmar charge under this provision. If investigators recover a communication, they must evaluate the actual words, context, sender attribution, mental-state requirements, and jurisdiction.

[Official U.S. Code: 18 U.S.C. 875](#)

12.6 Unauthorized computer access

18 U.S.C. 1030 covers specified unauthorized or excess computer access, fraud, damage, password trafficking, and related conduct. The source alleges a supposed archive and possible idea appropriation, but does not allege with supporting facts that Bulmar accessed the declarant's computer without authorization, obtained information from it, damaged it, or trafficked credentials. Similarity of ideas or possession of one's own device does not satisfy the statute.

[Official U.S. Code: 18 U.S.C. 1030](#)

12.7 Obstruction, records, and witnesses

18 U.S.C. 1519 requires knowing alteration, destruction, concealment, or falsification of a record with intent to impede a matter within U.S. agency jurisdiction or a federal bankruptcy matter. The combined source attributes deletion of past records mainly to another person, not Bulmar. It does not presently establish that Bulmar destroyed or falsified a record in contemplation of a qualifying U.S. matter.

18 U.S.C. 1512 prohibits specified witness tampering, corrupt persuasion, misleading conduct, harassment, and evidence impairment connected to federal proceedings or communications to federal law enforcement. The source asks witnesses to speak, but does not identify a Bulmar threat, instruction, payment, intimidation act, or corrupt communication directed at a witness. The provision is a preservation warning, not a supported present allegation.

[Official U.S. Code: 18 U.S.C. 1519](#)

[Official U.S. Code: 18 U.S.C. 1512](#)

13. Jurisdiction and Charging Limits

13.1 Canadian events and U.S. nexus

The shared-house events are described as occurring in Toronto, Ontario. A U.S. federal court does not acquire criminal jurisdiction merely because the declarant later requests U.S. review, mentions U.S. investors, or uses internet services. Each statute has its own territorial, commerce, venue, and subject-matter requirements. The subject's citizenship, residence, travel, platform location, server path, alleged victim location, and any U.S. act must be established.

13.2 Trade-secret extraterritoriality

18 U.S.C. 1837 extends the federal trade-secret chapter to conduct outside the United States only when the offender is a U.S. citizen or permanent resident, an organization formed under U.S. law, or an act in furtherance occurred in the United States. The present source does not establish any of those facts for Bulmar.

[Official U.S. Code: 18 U.S.C. 1837](#)

13.3 Civil, criminal, and evidentiary distinctions

A disagreement about credit can raise contractual, confidential-relationship, trade-secret, patent, copyright, defamation, or unfair-competition questions, but the correct theory depends on facts. Criminal statutes require proof of every element beyond a reasonable doubt. Civil claims have different burdens, limitations periods, privileges, damages rules, and jurisdiction requirements. A report to authorities should present evidence and preserve options rather than pronounce guilt or sentence.

No recommendation for punishment is made here. Charging and sentencing belong to competent authorities after notice, admissible evidence, jurisdiction, defenses, and due process.

14. Evidence Preservation and Investigation Plan

14.1 Immediate preservation

1. Preserve the original combinedBulmar.txt and each underlying note file in read-only form; calculate cryptographic hashes; retain file-system metadata and backup provenance.
2. Preserve all screenshots in original resolution with filenames, creation times, URL bars, account handles, and surrounding browser context.
3. Export relevant emails in native EML or MBOX form with full headers and attachments, rather than screenshots alone.
4. Preserve platform data through formal requests where available: account IDs, login history, posts, direct messages, uploads, deletions, URL identifiers, timestamps, and IP records.
5. Preserve original CAD, image, text, and presentation files with cloud revision histories, backups, attachment histories, and prior public uploads.
6. Do not alter, annotate, rename, or resave original evidence. Work from verified copies and maintain a chain-of-custody log.

14.2 Residence and property evidence

7. Obtain tenancy records, room assignments, move-in and move-out dates, and contact information for residents.
8. Interview Cesar, Steve, Laura, Festus, and any landlord or resident with first-hand knowledge of the equipment proposal, common-area access, discarded belongings, and conversations.

9. Identify every electronic device or storage medium known to have been left in the house, who handled it, and what became of it.
10. Locate purchase, sale, repair, eBay, adapter, and computer records that can establish the declarant's devices and dates.
11. Search lawfully for the alleged photograph, including original files, messages, backups, recipients, and publication history.

14.3 Authorship and priority evidence

12. Create a concept-by-concept chart limited to the space-escalator, jumbo motorcycle, spherical spacecraft, and any specifically identified later claim.
13. For each concept, list the earliest dated record from each claimant, all intermediate revisions, recipients, and public disclosures.
14. Use native-file metadata and third-party timestamps; do not rely solely on memory or self-created retrospective summaries.
15. Compare specific elements and language, not generic categories such as cubes, bicycles, spheres, servers, or maker activity.
16. Determine whether any material was confidential and what reasonable secrecy measures existed before disclosure.
17. Determine whether Bulmar used, disclosed, sold, patented, licensed, pitched, or profited from any specific material.

14.4 Alleged confession

18. Identify the exact date range and platform or physical setting.
19. Obtain the verbatim statement, original media, account identifier, and full surrounding context.
20. Interview each witness separately before witnesses compare memories.
21. Ask whether the statement concerned the digital-device claim, one idea, all ideas, conduct toward the declarant, or something unrelated.
22. Document any later retraction, clarification, apology, or renewed assertion.

15. Questions for the Subject and Witnesses

15.1 Questions for Robert Bulmar

23. Confirm the correct spelling of your name, residence dates, room location, and relationship with the declarant.
24. Did the declarant ask to place CNC machines or 3D printers downstairs? What was your response and why?

25. What conversations did you hear or join concerning investors, idea valuations, monitoring, or product concepts?
26. What property did you leave when moving out? Did it include any drive, USB device, computer, server, phone, optical media, notebook, or design material?
27. Did the declarant take a multimeter? Did you ever characterize that object as a storage device?
28. Did you ever state that the declarant found, copied, thwarted, stored, or used your ideas? Identify each idea, the statement, recipient, and evidence.
29. What dated third-party records support any claim of prior conception?
30. Did you create, send, like, post, request, or control content concerning an old server, recycled computer, tricycle, jumbo motorcycle, pyramids, space escalator, cubes, or spherical spacecraft?
31. Did you make any admission, apology, retraction, settlement, joke, or statement that the declarant understood as a confession?
32. Did you photograph the declarant near his room or in the kitchen? If so, what became of the image and was it shared?
33. Did you coordinate with any other person about the declarant, his ideas, his reputation, or evidence?
34. Have you deleted, altered, or asked anyone to delete a relevant account, file, message, photograph, or device record?

15.2 Questions for witnesses

35. What did you personally see or hear, as distinct from what someone later told you?
36. Can you identify the date, location, device, account, and exact words?
37. Did Bulmar claim ownership of a specific idea before the declarant presented it?
38. Did Bulmar or anyone else describe a drive, server, discarded computer, or archive in the house?
39. Did Steve oppose a Bulmar claim, and what exactly did Steve say?
40. Did Bulmar make a confession or retraction? Was it limited or general?
41. Did you see Bulmar photograph the declarant, or receive such a photograph?
42. Have you discussed your memory with other witnesses or seen later material that could have influenced it?

16. Conclusion

The source presents a coherent core allegation that Robert Bulmar advanced or revived a false story that the declarant acquired ideas from a digital storage medium left in a shared residence, and that Bulmar used that story or related claims to challenge credit for certain concepts. It also alleges an earlier confession, a period of silence, and a later revival, plus an incident involving an embarrassing photograph.

The declarant supplies concrete investigative leads: the shared-house occupants, the discarded-items container and multimeter, possible emails and eBay records, design-file histories, an alleged opposition by Steve, an alleged confession, and several identifiable online themes. Those leads justify careful preservation and focused inquiry.

The present material does not authenticate a direct Bulmar statement, establish the content or scope of the alleged confession, prove unauthorized access or use, show a commercial benefit, or establish a U.S. jurisdictional nexus. Several allegations are explicitly uncertain and many depend on interpreting online 'relays.' A fair authority should neither dismiss the account solely because it is fragmented nor accept its conclusions without attribution and corroboration. The next proper step is evidence recovery, separate witness interviews, a concept-by-concept provenance comparison, and an opportunity for Bulmar to answer the specific claims.

Appendix A: Allegation and Corroboration Inventory

A1. Bulmar was a co-resident in the Toronto house.

Current status: Direct recollection

Corroboration needed: Tenancy and landlord records; resident interviews.

A2. Bulmar refused the declarant's proposal to place CNC/3D-printing equipment in the downstairs common area.

Current status: Direct recollection

Corroboration needed: Cesar, Steve, and Robert interviews; messages.

A3. Bulmar could overhear investment and idea discussions from his room.

Current status: Inference based on proximity

Corroboration needed: Room layout; dates; witness recollection; messages.

A4. Bulmar knew or was warned about alleged monitoring.

Current status: Direct recollection but imprecise

Corroboration needed: Contemporaneous messages and resident testimony.

A5. Bulmar moved out after hearing investment-related discussion.

Current status: Sequence asserted; motive inferred

Corroboration needed: Tenancy dates and communications.

A6. Bulmar left property in a plastic container.

Current status: Direct recollection

Corroboration needed: Inventory, photographs, residents, landlord.

A7. The declarant took only a multimeter, not a storage device.

Current status: Direct recollection

Corroboration needed: Object, purchase/sale records, witnesses, device inventory.

A8. Bulmar advanced a digital-storage or old-server narrative.

Current status: Reported interpretation

Corroboration needed: Authenticated post/message, account logs, exact words.

A9. Bulmar alleged that the declarant obtained ideas from lost or discarded digital files.

Current status: Reported interpretation

Corroboration needed: Direct statement and provenance.

A10. Steve opposed Bulmar's digital-storage claim.

Current status: Reported witness lead

Corroboration needed: Interview Steve and other witnesses; recover message.

A11. Bulmar attempted to claim the space-escalator concept.

Current status: Allegation with no competing work attached

Corroboration needed: Earliest Bulmar record; declarant versions; witnesses.

A12. Steve defended the declarant against Bulmar on the space-escalator dispute.

Current status: Reported witness lead

Corroboration needed: Witnesses and original communications.

A13. Bulmar used his self-made tricycle history to support a later jumbo-motorcycle claim.

Current status: Inference from online material

Corroboration needed: Authenticated Bulmar claim and dated design comparison.

A14. Bulmar may have tried to claim the spherical spacecraft.

Current status: Expressly uncertain

Corroboration needed: Do not treat as fact without direct corroboration.

A15. Bulmar made only follow-up claims after the declarant's presentations.

Current status: Chronology inference

Corroboration needed: Concept-by-concept verified timeline.

A16. Bulmar lacked third-party records predating the declarant.

Current status: Declarant's prediction; absence not yet proven

Corroboration needed: Subpoenaed or voluntary records, devices, witnesses.

A17. Bulmar confessed or abandoned the accusations years ago.

Current status: Repeated allegation; material details absent

Corroboration needed: Exact statement, date, medium, context, witnesses.

A18. The confession covered the entire dispute.

Current status: Declarant's interpretation

Corroboration needed: Original statement and contextual testimony.

A19. Bulmar later revived the allegations after a long silence.

Current status: Reported interpretation

Corroboration needed: Authenticated later statements and dates.

A20. Bulmar waited near the declarant's room to take an embarrassing photograph.

Current status: Direct allegation

Corroboration needed: Image, EXIF, device data, recipients, witnesses.

A21. Bulmar intended public humiliation through the photograph.

Current status: Motive inference

Corroboration needed: Transmission or publication evidence; statements.

A22. Bulmar coordinated with others to frame the declarant.

Current status: General inference; no agreement identified

Corroboration needed: Communications, overt acts, shared objective.

A23. Bulmar's actions caused continuing emotional and work-related harm.

Current status: Claimed impact

Corroboration needed: Attribution, contemporaneous records, concrete losses.

Appendix B: Source Locator Index

Line numbers refer to the fresh static copy of combinedBulmar.txt supplied with the June 28, 2026 request. Underlying filenames are preserved because they offer a second locator if combined-file line numbers change.

Source unit	Combined lines	Principal relevance
184866.txt	Lines 4-124	House relationship; maker history; shared-equipment proposal; monitoring and investment context.
fewq324213.txt	Lines 127-319	Digital-storage denial; references to Bulmar imagery; pre-house interests.
fewq324323.txt	Lines 322-341	Bulmar screenshot/face interpretation; generalized framing concern.
garetw34123.txt	Lines 563-648	Core Bulmar allegation; confession; follow-up; digital-storage narrative; third-party-record argument.
gawe4534.txt	Lines 651-733	Alleged confession and revival; request for witnesses.
gre324333.txt	Lines 1085-1294	Alleged confession years earlier; storage issue; timing and contradiction analysis.
gre34231323.txt	Lines 1297-1385	Bulmar's self-made tricycle; jumbo-motorcycle dispute; process evidence.
grew44231232.txt	Lines 2474-2547	No-storage assertion; alleged support by Steve; live creation and post-it notes.
grw32323.txt	Lines 2550-2590	Bulmar face/relay interpretation; confession and continued-harm allegation.

Source unit	Combined lines	Principal relevance
gwer432123.txt	Lines 2683-2955	Detailed design lineage; space-escalator and cube development; uncertainty about Robert's presentation.
gwert3424.txt	Lines 2987-3151	Spherical spacecraft details; expressly qualified possible Bulmar attempt.
he45234344.txt	Lines 3969-4012	Digital-archive allegation; confession; trial-and-error and chronology reasoning.
he5341234.txt	Lines 4015-4050	Possible Bulmar and Steve motorcycle appropriation; expressly tentative attribution.
hiuhi98789.txt	Lines 4053-4102	Alleged confession; digital-device denial; photography context; U.S.-court request.
hiuhiy987.txt	Lines 4105-4235	Old-server thumbnail; no storage or written notes; confession and revival theory.
hiuyu87998.txt	Lines 4802-4829	Possible Steve defense against Bulmar; witness request.
hoiui98089.txt	Lines 4857-5023	Spherical spacecraft allegation expressly uncertain; witness request.
hoiuou8908.txt	Lines 5026-5050	Conditional relay attribution; confession and adaptation theory.
j3joi3j3.txt	Lines 5429-5532	Space-escalator dispute; Steve alleged to defend against Robert.
j3oij32oj3i.txt	Lines 5544-5659	Lost digital-format narrative; confession; witness and preservation request.
jio3joi23jo2.txt	Lines 5662-5773	Plastic container; multimeter; no storage medium; alleged photograph; confession and revival.
jo3ij2i3ojoi32.txt	Lines 5776-5847	Pre-house maker history; CNC/3D-printer proposal; Robert's refusal.
joi3j2io3ji2.txt	Lines 6088-6134	Possible overhearing, move-out sequence, delayed accusations, alleged confession.
ugfuu67786.txt	Lines 7552-7633	Generalized reference to Robert and Steve attempting idea theft; limited specificity.
yvguioh7980.txt	Lines 7783-8095	Motorcycle design evolution; late conditional reference to possible Bulmar attempt.

Appendix C: Official Legal Authorities

[17 U.S.C. 102](#): Copyright protects qualifying fixed expression; subsection (b) excludes ideas, processes, systems, methods, concepts, principles, and discoveries.

[18 U.S.C. 1832](#): Criminal theft of trade secrets, including specified copying, receipt, attempt, and conspiracy conduct, subject to intent and commerce elements.

[18 U.S.C. 1836](#): Federal civil action for an owner of a qualifying trade secret that is misappropriated and related to interstate or foreign commerce.

[18 U.S.C. 1837](#): Limited extraterritorial reach of the federal trade-secret chapter.

[18 U.S.C. 1839](#): Definitions of trade secret, owner, and misappropriation, including secrecy measures and economic value.

[18 U.S.C. 1343](#): Wire fraud involving a scheme to defraud or obtain money or property and a qualifying wire transmission.

[18 U.S.C. 1349](#): Attempt or conspiracy to commit a Chapter 63 fraud offense.

[18 U.S.C. 2261A](#): Interstate stalking and cyberstalking, subject to intent, course-of-conduct, harm, and jurisdiction elements.

[18 U.S.C. 875](#): Interstate or foreign communications containing specified threats or extortionate demands.

[18 U.S.C. 1030](#): Specified unauthorized computer access, fraud, damage, credential, and extortion offenses.

[18 U.S.C. 1512](#): Witness, victim, and informant tampering, including specified intimidation, corrupt persuasion, misleading conduct, harassment, and evidence impairment.

[18 U.S.C. 1519](#): Destruction, concealment, alteration, or falsification of records with intent to affect qualifying U.S. matters.

Authorities accessed from the Office of the Law Revision Counsel, United States House of Representatives, and checked as current through June 2026. Statutory text and effective dates should be rechecked at the time of any filing.